



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/086,370

02/28/2002

Michael E. Childs

702.124

2692

38933

7590

02/17/2010

GARMIN LTD.

C/O GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.

ATTN: Legal - IP

1200 EAST 151ST STREET

OLATHE, KS 66062

EXAMINER

MANCHO, RONNIE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3664

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/17/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTS@GARMIN.COM

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10086370	2/28/2002	CHILDS ET AL.	702.124

GARMIN LTD.  
C/O GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
ATTN: Legal - IP  
1200 EAST 151ST STREET  
OLATHE, KS 66062

**EXAMINER**

RONNIE MANCHO

ART UNIT	PAPER
3664	20100204

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The Reply brief dated 9/4/09 has been acknowledged.

In the reply applicant alleges that the examiner for the first time made a new 112 rejection on a third appeal after 7 years. Applicant's remarks are not persuasive. The 112 rejection is not new since it is referring to the same limitation in the claim. In the examiner's answer dated 8-6-09, the 112 rejection was written to incorporate the entire phrase of the same previously rejected claimed limitation. Therefore, the 112 rejection is not new.

However, applicant has not requested a first office action in view of the alleged new 112 rejection.

As such applicant's remarks are not convincing.

It is believed that all rejections in the answer are proper and should stand.

/Ronnie Mancho/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3664